



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"I assure you," he says, "that the only satisfaction which I retain in having written at all on this subject is, that it has induced you to write so consummate a work. I confess that I felt some pain when I first read it, at finding myself refuted in a manner so conclusive; but the utility and the beauty of your treatise have, at length, got the better of my weakness; and in the joy of contemplating the truth exhibited in a light so transparent, I called on my fellow student here to partake of my own admiration. You need have no difficulty, therefore, in stating publicly, whenever it may fall in your way, that I entirely adopt and concur in your opinions."

We confess that to us this noble act of homage to truth, and frank admission of error, is most touching, and worthy of all admiration. How different in spirit from that contentious and vainglorious love of personal victory, which has so often obscured the dignity of men of genius and learning? When will the world cease to worship at the shrine of mere intellect, and appreciate at its due worth that greatness of soul, which is ready to sacrifice every thing at the altar of truth alone?

Mabillon, among many other controversies of the times in which he lived, had the courage to engage his pen on the delicate subject of saintly relics, which has so often been made the subject of attack by Protestant writers, and somewhat disingenuously upheld by those of the Church of Rome. In the days of Mabillon the altars of the Church were everywhere enriched by the relics of saints and martyrs, of which the catacombs of Rome afforded an inexhaustible supply. It is true that to watch over this precious deposit, and to discriminate the spurious article from the true, was the peculiar office of a congregation at Rome, selected for that purpose from the Sacred College. But though the skill and the integrity of Cardinals might, by devout Roman Catholics, be thought remote from all suspicion, who could answer for the good faith of their subordinate agents? and what was the security that the worship appropriated by the Church to the bones of the blessed, might not be actually rendered to the skeletons of the ungodly?

When teaching the art of discriminating between the osseous remains of different mammalia, Cuvier never displayed a more edifying seriousness than was exhibited by Mabillon in laying down the laws which determine whether any given bone belonged of yore to a sinner or a saint. The miracle-working criterion, though apparently the best of all (and so largely and confidently relied on in earlier as well as later times), being rejected silently, and not without very good reason, Mabillon addressed a letter, "De Cultu Sanctonum ignotorum," to Theophilus Gallus, in which he discussed the sufficiency of three other tests, which have not unfrequently been relied on since, as confidently as if their fallaciousness had never been exposed.

First, he inquired, are we sure of the sanctity of a bone extracted from a sepulchre, on which an anagram of the name of Christ is sculptured in the midst of palms and laurels? The answer is discouraging: because it is a well-ascertained fact, that the body of one Flavia Jovina was found in this precise predicament; and, yet, she was a simple neophyte. Then, secondly, are we safe if a vase stained with blood be also found in the tomb; of course, nothing could be more secure, if only we could be quite certain that the blood of martyrs was buried with them in vases, and also that the stain was sanguineous, and was not produced by the perfumes which the ancients were accustomed to heap up in such vessels.\* But, thirdly, what if the word "martyr" be engraven on the stone? In that case (provided the inscription be certainly genuine), all doubt might be at an end, were it not for a sophistical doctrine of *equivalents* which the relic dealers have propagated. Thus, for example, at the Abbey of St. Martin, at Pontoise, the devout had long been honouring the corpse of one Ursinus, in the tranquil belief that the words of his sepulchral inscription were *equivalent* to a declaration of martyrdom, whereas, on examination, they turned out to be really as follows:—"Here lies Ursinus, who died on the 1st of June, after living with his wife, Leontia, 20 years and 6 months, and in the world, 49 years 4 months and 3 days. Thus poor Ursinus's only recorded martyrdom was the endurance of Leontia's conjugal society for twenty years and upwards! which passed, however, among the devout at Pontoise as proof of St. Ursinus's martyrdom 1,000 years before. If the learned Benedictine had been as happy in the canons which he laid down for the guidance of the faithful, as he was in exposing the fallaciousness of those generally relied on, Protestants might, in aftertimes, have been rivals with their Roman Catholic brethren, in the purchase of those venerable antiquities. To assert, however, that any such question was debated at all before the tribunal of human reason, was an act of liberalism, which even a Mabillon was required to expiate. Long and anxious were the debates in the Congregation of the Index, whether the book should not be condemned, and the temerity of the author rebuked; nor would that censure have been averted, but for the interference of the Pope in person, who prudently made himself sponsor for the willingness of the learned author to explain in a new edition, whatever might be thought objectionable in the first; and the worthy but submissive Benedictine having redeemed the pledge, the letter, "De Cultu

Sanctorum ignotorum," was not only acquitted of reproach by the Sacred College, but even honoured with their emphatic approbation.

Mabillon gave a yet more decisive proof of his not being disposed to any extravagant scepticism; one which, perhaps, may even excite in most of our readers, a smile at his credulity. There was living in his days a M. Thiers, a man of singular talents and remarkable courage, who had accused the Benedictine Fathers of Vendome of an egregious imposture, in exhibiting at their convent one of those *tears which fell from the eyes of Jesus* when he wept at the grave of Lazarus! An angel (such was the legend) had treasured it up, and given it to Mary, the sister of the deceased. It passed some centuries afterwards to the treasury of relics at Constantinople, and was bestowed by some Greek Emperor upon some German mercenaries in reward for some services to his crown; they placed it in the Abbey of Frisingen, whence it was conveyed by the Emperor, Henry III., who transferred it to his mother-in-law, Agnes of Anjou, the foundress of the monastery of Vendome, where she deposited it. Mabillon threw the shield of his boundless learning round this tradition; maintaining that the genuineness of the relic might, at least, be *reasonably presumed* from the admitted facts of the case; that it had a *prescriptive* claim to the honours it received; and that his brethren ought to be left in *peaceable enjoyment* of the advantages they derived from the exhibition in their Church, at Vendome, of the *Holy Tear of Bethany*!

Who can wonder that where legends like this were gravely upheld by the most learned writers, and the most enlightened generation of men whom Europe had ever seen, were invited to study and believe a mass of fables, of which the most audacious Grecian mythologist would have been ashamed, that half a century did not elapse before a race of philosophers arose who availed themselves of the materials which the Benedictine annals too copiously furnished them with for that overwhelming ridicule, by which they unsparingly strove to extinguish all religion, under the debris of its mediæval superstitions?

Passing, however, from fables too puerile for the nursery, to inquiries which have hitherto perplexed the senate, Mabillon undertook to explain the right principles of prison discipline in a work entitled "Réflexions Sur les Prisons des Ordres Religieux." He insisted that by a judicious attention and mixture of solitude, labour, silence, and devotion, it was practicable to render the goal a school for the improvement of its unhappy inmates in social unity and in moral character. We have not space to follow him in the details of his benevolent speculation; but it is admitted on all hands, that the honour, which one of his biographers, M. de Malan, challenges for him, of being the very earliest of those who have applied themselves to this difficult subject in the spirit of philanthropy and wisdom, is strictly his due; and we cordially respond to the sentiment of Sir James Stephen (to whose able article in the "Edinburgh Review" we are largely indebted for what we have here presented to our readers), that to the enlightened reformer of prisons may be cheerfully forgiven his sacred osteology, and even his defence of the Holy Tear of Vendome. Though in bondage to the prejudices of his own age, he was able to break through the bonds which have shackled so many powerful minds in later and more enlightened times; and it gives us sincere pleasure, while protesting against the errors of Mabillon and his confraternity, to do homage to their candour and learning, and claim fellowship with the piety, the wisdom, and the love, which, in the midst even of all the errors of other Christian societies, attest the Divine original of all.

#### ST. THEUDOSIA.

OUR readers have, probably, not forgotten the history which we gave in our number for May, of the fictitious life of St. Philomena, who never existed; we invite their attention now to the history of St. Theodosia. We take our account chiefly from an article, headed "TRANSLATION OF THE RELICS OF ST. THEUDOSIA," in the *Tablet* Newspaper, of October 22, 1853.

On that occasion were assembled, in the Church of Amiens, in France, THREE CARDINALS—to wit, Cardinal Wiseman, the Cardinal Archbishops of Rheims and Tours; six other archbishops, among whom we find Dr. M'Hale, and Dr. Cullen, and "the Archbishop of Babylon," a rather suspicious title certainly; but some of our readers may be led to suspect that they were all archbishops of "Babylon." There were, also, present NINETEEN bishops, besides mitred abbots, deans, &c., and between 1,200 and 1,300 ecclesiastics—many of whom had come great distances to be present.

For what was this reverend assembly held?

The cardinal archbishop took his seat, having on his right and left the Bishops of Poitiers and Amiens, the deputy of the clergy, and the deputy of the faithful, who had been sent to bring back from Paris to Amiens the precious relics of St. Theodosia, which they had previously had to bring from Genoa to Paris.

A speech was then made by the deputy of the clergy (the Dean of Piquigny), from which we extract the following:—"The body of St. Theodosia touches at this moment the soil which beheld her birth, and re-appears in the midst of us, after fifteen centuries, decorated with the aureole of the saints, and the palm of the martyrs. . . . He goes on to say, that St. Theodosia is now to repose

finally in the Cathedral of Amiens, and proceeds—"There St. Theodosia, restored to our veneration, will diffuse over the episcopal city, and over the whole country, her graces and favours; shall remove from us calamities and alarms; will obtain for us the preservation of the faith for which she shed her generous blood," &c.

Then spoke the deputy of the faithful (or the laity) of Amiens (the Count of Escalopier)—". . . If, like the look-out of a ship who discovers a luminous point on a far off land, I have been fortunate enough to signalize to you the existence of a treasure, it is to you my Lord (the Bishop of Amiens), it is to your solicitude, to the peculiar affection, so reasonable and so special, which you bear towards his Holiness Pope Pius IX., that we owe the possession of the precious body of St. Theodosia, and the triumph which awaits it," &c.

The Bishop of Amiens "replied in the most gracious manner to the honourable deputies—his lordship declared that that day in which the relics of St. Theodosia were brought back to their country, was the most glorious of his life. He addressed, in the name of the clergy, his thanks to the Count of Escalopier, who, having discovered the precious treasure of which we this day take possession, was in some sort the inspirer of the great religious manifestation which will take place in the festival of to-morrow."

The cardinal archbishop then spoke, and told the assembly how much he desired "to assist at that ceremony, in order to find there the occasion of solemnly renewing his immovable attachment to the holy Catholic Church."

Then was read a document from the Lord Bishop of Porphyrium, who had charge of the relics of St. Theodosia from Rome, to deliver them at Genoa to the Bishop of Amiens, "in exchange for those of St. Viator" (of whom we hear no more on this occasion; but, doubtless, we shall have him again in his turn).

Then the marble tombstone of the saint "was also offered to the view of all." The inscription is not reported in the *Tablet*; but we have got it from another source, and will give it farther on.

From all this we collect the history of St. Theodosia. She was born at Amiens; she died a martyr at Rome, fifteen centuries ago; her tombstone and body was found at Rome the other day, by the Count of Escalopier; the Pope made a present of it to the Bishop of Amiens, as a reward for the bishop's great devotion to the Pope; the Pope forwarded the box to Genoa; a deputation had been sent to bring it first to Paris, and then to Amiens; and St. Theodosia was at last returned, "all resplendent with glory," to her native city; and cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastics were assembled from so many distant countries to receive her with honour.

All this was only the prelude to the splendid show of the next day. No words can do justice to the procession. The decorations of the houses, the triumphal arches, the obelisks, the green velvet with fringe of gold, "the magnificent domes of verdure, suspended in the air, with pendants of green velvet and white calico," "the magnificent triumphal arch in verdure," the "red dome, sprinkled with stars of gold, suspended from two very lofty masts of verdure," the cavalry and infantry, the statues, "the magnificent gilded chariot which bore the precious relics of St. Theodosia"—of which the account in the *Tablet* says, "we are obliged to relinquish the attempt to describe THE TRIUMPHAL CAR OF St. Theodosia: here the pen is powerless—the painter only could give the image of it"—and then the cardinals, the archbishops, the bishops, the canons, all dressed in silks and ribbons, as fine as any lady for a ball—such is but a feeble attempt to describe this magnificent display.

"The next day the relics of St. Theodosia, surrounded as with a golden crown, on which the statues of the different saints of the diocese were conspicuous, was suspended in the air, above the high altar—this decoration offered the most beautiful spectacle one could see."

We had almost forgotten the sermon which was preached by Cardinal Wiseman, of which we have room but for one extract—"Yes, Theodosia, YOUR BONES, humiliated for Jesus Christ, have this day trembled with joy, and communicated to us their transports of gladness; and this joy, this festival, will have durable results; they lay for the future the foundations of a MORE SOLID AND FIRM PIETY. What Lucy is for Syracuse, Agatha for Catania, Genevieve for Paris, Agnes for Rome, Theodosia will be, is already, for Amiens. She will become the object of a DEVOTION, daily more tender;" and then he addresses Theodosia herself—"And, if up to the present time, unknown to themselves, you have, nevertheless, prayed for them, how much more for the future, being invoked by them with fervour and confidence, will you not redouble your powerful INTERCESSIONS unto the God of Martyrs?"

Thus we have endeavoured to give some faint idea of this grand display and ceremonial. And, now, we think, our readers will be ready to exclaim, before we conclude—"Who is this St. Theodosia who is to do such mighty things? Tell us something of her history! tell us her miracles while living! tell us of the superhuman virtues by which she merited to become an intercessor for us with God!"

Our answer to this must be very short; for there exist no materials for a longer answer. It is this—"In all the histories of the Church, in all its records, in all its annals up to this day, there is no mention made that there ever was any such person as St. Theodosia, of Amiens; there

\* Other archaeologists are of opinion that what in such phials is called blood, was the deposit of the wine used in the communion.

is no trace existing in history of such a saint." This is the only answer we can give from the history of the Church! This striking fact is actually confessed by M. L'Abbe Gerbet, the Vicar-General of the Diocese of Amiens, in a tract which he has published on St. Theodosia. He says—"Nous n'avons aucun monument historique qui renferme quelques détails sur Sainte Theodosie. Les anciens martyrologes, Romains et Gallicans n'ont pas recueilli son nom"—that is, "We have not any historical document which contains any details about Saint Theodosia. The ancient Roman and French martyrologies have not even mentioned her name!"

And what does it all rest upon—this splendid festival at Amiens, got up by Pope, cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and ecclesiastics? Why, upon this—The Count of Escalopier, a French nobleman of Amiens, in his travels at Rome, found a tombstone in the catacombs of Rome (an ancient burial-place), with this inscription:—

Aurelie Theodosiae,  
Benignissima et  
Incomparabili femina,  
Aurelius Optatus  
Conjugi innocentissimæ  
Depos. Pr. Kal. Dec.  
Nat. Ambiana  
B. M. F.

## TRANSLATION.

To Aurelia Theodosia,  
A most benign  
And incomparable woman,  
Aurelius Optatus,  
To his most innocent wife,  
Buried 30th November,  
By nation an Ambian,  
To her who well deserves it,  
He placed this monument.

Here you have, reader, the *whole* that is known on earth of Theodosia! here you have the credentials of the saint and martyr! of a new object of invocation! of a new intercessor between God and man!

This inscription is the *foundation*, THE ONLY FOUNDATION of the faith of those who have recourse to her intercession with God!

But for once we have made a mistake—we have forgotten a *fact*—in digging for the bones, a *little glass bottle* was dug up. Mark that, reader, for it is very important. What could that bottle have been for but to hold the blood of Theodosia? And why should her blood have been bottled, unless she was a martyr?

The Count of Escalopier (who, perhaps, came to Rome to look for something of the kind), submitted this tombstone and *glass bottle* to a Roman tribunal, called "the Congregation of Relics," whose duty it is to pronounce what relics are genuine. He submitted this evidence (and this alone, for there was no other evidence to submit); and on this evidence the tribunal pronounced that the bones he produced were the bones of Theodosia; that Theodosia was a saint and a martyr, and that she was a native of Amiens, in France!

The Pope himself confirmed this decision upon this evidence, and proceeded to make a decree that the name of Theodosia should now be added to the ritual of the Church of Amiens; that an office should be inserted there in her honour; and that henceforth masses should be celebrated in her honour in all the parishes in the diocese of Amiens, and an annual festival be celebrated in her memory!

Will our readers look over the inscription again, and imagine, if they can, the infallibility of the Pope who could pass such a decree upon such evidence!

But was this woman "born at Amiens?" So the Pope and congregation of relics translated *Nat. Ambiana*; \* for Ambianum they said was the Latin name of Amiens. True, that was its name once; but too late to serve the turn; for its original name was Samanobria; and the Roman Emperor, Gratian, changed its name to Ambianis,† after the empire was become Christian, and the age of martyrdom had gone by. Will any of our readers now invoke St. Theodosia, or seek her intercession with God, on the faith of that inscription and the glass bottle? Will they believe in Pope, cardinals, archbishops (Irish ones, too), bishops, and ecclesiastics, teaching them to invoke dead women on such grounds?

Have we not proof here that the Church of Rome with all its infallibility, with all its machinery, is not fit to be trusted or followed in the question of the invocation of saints?

We hope to be able to show our readers more of this manufacture of saintly relics—of the manner in which joint-stock companies are got up, and people are invited to take shares in the buying and selling of relics as a good speculation, just as they would in a railway. And a very good investment for money it is for those who have no conscience. We hope to produce some evidence on this subject.

\* It is almost inconceivable that the Congregation of Sacred Relics at Rome should be so grossly ignorant respecting Latin inscriptions as to take "nat." for a contraction of "nata," instead of for "natione," for which it always stands in such inscriptions. The inscription says nothing whatever about where Theodosia was born, but only states the nation from which she was sprung. How the poor people of Amiens have been gulled by infallibility? If infallibility be necessary in anything, it surely is necessary in directing us to true objects of worship.

† Sigibert, ad. A.D. 382.

## IMMUTABILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

## TRADITION AND DEVELOPMENT.

ONE of the greatest difficulties that Protestants have to contend against in their controversies with Roman Catholics is, to ascertain what is, and what is not, the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome. That there should be any doubt upon so fundamental a point, especially in the case of a Church which claims to be infallible, may be a novel and startling statement to those of our Roman Catholic readers who implicitly believe that the doctrines of their Church are fixed, unchanged, and unchangeable—the same now as in the first ages of Christianity, and destined to remain without a shade of variation to the end of time. Nor is it, indeed, at all surprising that they should believe this. They have heard it reiterated a thousand times that "Rome is immutable;" and they very naturally acquiesce in the truth of an assertion which, while it seems to invest their own Church with one of the sublimest of all attributes, implies, at the same time, that every other form of Christian profession, must be, from its very nature, novel and transitory. Our object in the present article is to show that this idea of the immutability of the teaching of the Church of Rome, is a mere illusion. And in proof of this position, we shall not enter upon a detailed examination of the various particular points on which she has changed, but we shall limit ourselves to the consideration of one great general question, which virtually includes all the rest—viz., Has the Church of Rome adhered invariably to the same opinion respecting the *Rule of Faith*?

Upon this fundamental point we assert that the teaching of the modern Church of Rome is diametrically opposed to the clear and formal decisions of the Council of Trent.

Tridentine Romanism declares the standard of faith to be fixed and invariable. Modern Romanism—as represented by the most eminent divines of that communion—maintains that there resides in the Church an unlimited and illimitable power of expanding it. Tridentine Romanism insists that the existing Church, at each particular moment of her history (*ἡ ἀπὸ ἀρχαίας*), possesses an inherent power of ordaining new Articles of Faith. Tridentine Romanism declares that the Rule of Faith was, once for all, stereotyped, as it were, in the primitive ages. Modern Romanism denies this, and informs us that it has been set up in moveable types,\* alterable from time to time, at the will of a living, infallible, authority. The Tridentine doctrine may be termed the theory of *Tradition*. The modern doctrine is known as the theory of *Development*.

Let us first consider the Tridentine doctrine upon this point. The invariable language of the Fathers of that Council is, that *all* the doctrines and *all* the practices which they decree to be true and obligatory, have *always* been the received doctrines of the Catholic Church in *every* age, without any the slightest variation, from the days of Christ and his Apostles, who were the first authors of the said doctrines and practices, down to the time in which the holy and oecumenical Synod of Trent assembled. Thus, for instance, the well-known decree respecting the Rule of Faith, passed in the 4th session, runs as follows:—"The sacred and holy, oecumenical and general, Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost . . . seeing clearly that this [saving] truth and [moral] discipline are contained in the *written books* and the *unwritten traditions*, which, received by the Apostles from the *mouth of Christ himself*, or from the *Apostles themselves*, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted, as it were, *from hand to hand*, (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the Books both of the Old and New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said Traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by *Christ's own word of mouth*, or by the *Holy Ghost*, and preserved in the *Catholic Church by a continuous succession*."† Here all saving truth and moral discipline are declared to have been delivered by the mouth of Christ himself or His inspired Apostles, and to have been handed down either in the Scriptures or by unbroken oral tradition. The same assertion is made in several other of the decrees—e.g., speaking of the Sacrament of Penance, the Fathers say, "The universal Church has *always* (semper) understood, &c." (Sess. xiv. c. 5); and, speaking of matrimony, they declare, "that the holy Fathers, the Councils, and the *tradition of the universal Church, always taught*, &c." (Sess. xxiv.). And in exact accordance with their statements, the famous Bossuet, writing against the theory of development, which had been recently propounded by Jurien, a Calvinistic minister, thus expresses himself—"What I affirm to be true is, that the *faith never varies* in the Church: that it *reached its perfection at once*, and was *well known from the very first*."‡ In reference to Jurien's assertion, that the mystery of the Trinity remained undeveloped down to the time of the Nicene Council, Bossuet designated such an opinion as a *horrible libel* on Christianity, worthy only of the lips of a Socinian.

Let us first consider the Tridentine doctrine upon this point. The invariable language of the Fathers of that Council is, that *all* the doctrines and *all* the practices which they decree to be true and obligatory, have *always* been the received doctrines of the Catholic Church in *every* age, without any the slightest variation, from the days of Christ and his Apostles, who were the first authors of the said doctrines and practices, down to the time in which the holy and oecumenical Synod of Trent assembled. Thus, for instance, the well-known decree respecting the Rule of Faith, passed in the 4th session, runs as follows:—"The sacred and holy, oecumenical and general, Synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost . . . seeing clearly that this [saving] truth and [moral] discipline are contained in the *written books* and the *unwritten traditions*, which, received by the Apostles from the *mouth of Christ himself*, or from the *Apostles themselves*, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted, as it were, *from hand to hand*, (the Synod) following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates, with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the Books both of the Old and New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said Traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated either by *Christ's own word of mouth*, or by the *Holy Ghost*, and preserved in the *Catholic Church by a continuous succession*."† Here all saving truth and moral discipline are declared to have been delivered by the mouth of Christ himself or His inspired Apostles, and to have been handed down either in the Scriptures or by unbroken oral tradition. The same assertion is made in several other of the decrees—e.g., speaking of the Sacrament of Penance, the Fathers say, "The universal Church has *always* (semper) understood, &c." (Sess. xiv. c. 5); and, speaking of matrimony, they declare, "that the holy Fathers, the Councils, and the *tradition of the universal Church, always taught*, &c." (Sess. xxiv.). And in exact accordance with their statements, the famous Bossuet, writing against the theory of development, which had been recently propounded by Jurien, a Calvinistic minister, thus expresses himself—"What I affirm to be true is, that the *faith never varies* in the Church: that it *reached its perfection at once*, and was *well known from the very first*."‡ In reference to Jurien's assertion, that the mystery of the Trinity remained undeveloped down to the time of the Nicene Council, Bossuet designated such an opinion as a *horrible libel* on Christianity, worthy only of the lips of a Socinian.

\* The illustration is Dr. Wordsworth's: See his *Letters to M. Gordon*, p. 32, 3rd edition.

† Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, translated by the Rev. J. Waterworth, pp. 17, 18.

‡ Bossuet, *Adversus Jurienum*, cited by Dr. Wordsworth, *Letters to M. Gordon*, p. 262.

"Can there," he proceeds to say, "be a greater error than to suppose that the faith of the Church only developed itself as heresies arose and according as she made *explicit* decisions respecting it? On the contrary, the Church never pronounced any judgments except in the way of propounding the *faith of the past*." To the same effect Dr. Milner says, in his well-known work, "The End of Religious Controversy"—"It is a fundamental maxim never to admit any tenet but such as is believed by all the bishops, and was believed by their predecessors up to the *Apostles themselves*." And again, "It is proper to observe that this holy Church, as declaring her doctrine, does not profess to argue upon it in a controversial way, either from Scripture or tradition; much less does she pretend to make new articles of faith, or to expound the original articles in a different sense from that in which she has *always* held them. In short, her constant language is, *Nil innovetur, nil nisi quod traditum est*. Such and such is the sense of Scripture, such and such is the doctrine of her predecessors, the Pastors of the Church, since the time of the Apostles." Again, Dr. Wiseman says, "We believe that no new doctrine can be introduced into the Church, but that every doctrine which we hold has existed and been taught in it, ever since the time of the Apostles, having been handed down by them to their successors," &c.† "It must not be thought that Catholics conceive there is a certain mass of vague and floating opinions, which may, at the option of the Pope, or of a General Council, or of the whole Church, be turned into articles of faith."‡ "As we admit that no new revelation of doctrines can be made, so do we believe that the power of the Church consists in nothing more than defining that which was believed from *all* times, and in all her dominions."§ And, to quote no more authorities, De Maistre, in his celebrated work, "Du Pape," contends that "there is *nothing new* in the Church of Rome, and that she will never believe anything which she has not believed *always*."

Such is the *Tradition* theory, and such are a few of the many high authorities by which it is supported. One would hardly expect that statements so plain and explicit, so solemnly propounded by the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent, and re-echoed by many of the most renowned theologians of Rome, would be flatly contradicted not only by equally eminent divines belonging to the same communion, whose fundamental principle and perpetual boast is *unity of doctrine*, but even by an infallible Pope himself. And yet, strange as it may seem, the fact is so. Pope Leo X., in his famous Bull against Luther, entitled "Exsurge Domine," condemns, as heretical, the assertion "that it is not in the power of the Church or Pope to constitute new articles of faith."|| Nor, was this a novel position. Before Leo's time, and about the middle of the fifteenth century, Cardinal Cusanus, an apostolic legate, and, as his biographer informs us, "by far the first of the theologians of his age," lays down the principle, that "the Scriptures are accommodated to the times, and are variously understood at different periods, so that at one time they are to be expounded in one way, according to the current practice of the Church, and that on the change of her practice, its sense is changed also."¶ That "the practice of the Church should at one time interpret Scripture in one way, and at another time in another way," he goes on to tell us is not surprising, because "the interpretation moves in a parallel line with the practice; and the practice which so moves is the spirit that gives life." To the same effect, exactly, the celebrated Salmeron declares that "God has not given all things to all men; that every age should rejoice in its own truths, which were unknown to preceding generations."\*\* And lastly, even Bellarmine, the great champion of Tridentine Romanism, and, consequently, a zealous upholder of the Tridentine theory, yet finds himself compelled to admit that the "stability of all dogmas depends on the authority of the existing Church,"†† and that the Church of latter time has power not only to explain and declare, but also to constitute those things which belong to faith.‡‡ This admission Bellarmine was compelled to make by the incontrovertible evidence of historical facts. He could not deny, for example, that before the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) Transubstantiation was not an article of faith. He could not deny that the practice of administering the Eucharist in both kinds existed in the Latin as well as in the Greek Church, down to the age of Thomas Aquinas (middle of the thirteenth century). He could not deny that it is declared, in the Canon Law, that "many things were allowed before the Gospel became clear which are now forbidden by the Church"—e.g., the marriage of the clergy.

We shall not stop to notice at length the remarkable application of this doctrine of a *gradual development* of the articles of faith which was made by the famous Jesuit Petavius, about the middle of the seventeenth century, and which called forth the great work of the English Protestant bishop Bull, "Defensio Fidei Nicenæ," for which he received, through Bossuet, the thanks of the Roman Catholic Clergy of France.§§ Suffice it to say, that

\* Wordsworth, p. 264. † Wiseman, *Moorfield Lectures*, vol. i., p. 60. London, 1847. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 61. § *Ibid.*, p. 88. || Bullar. Roman. vol. v., p. 483. ¶ Cusan ad Bohem., c. 2. \*\* Salmeron, *dis.* 57, in ep ad Rom. †† *De sacram.* ii. 25. ‡‡ Bellarm. de Sum Pontif. lib. iv., c. 2-4. §§ See, on this subject, Dr. Newman's work, "Prophecy of the Church," p. 72, sq.